



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a year after the appearance of Coleridge's fragment in the *Morning Post*. The resemblance is evident, and rather striking. "Pale Melancholy" has "sat retired" since Collins so stationed her in 1748, but she first "mused herself to sleep" in Coleridge's imagination.⁵ Not, however, for the first time in the fragment under consideration.

In the autumn of 1796 Coleridge and Lloyd spent a week with Poole at Nether Stowey, the result of which was a poem to Lloyd, published in the *Poems* of 1797 under the title *To a Young Friend on his Proposing to Domesticate with the Author*. It is an enthusiastic description, very slightly allegorized, of the beauties of nature that will surround the poet and his disciple when they are settled at Stowey. The dell is not pictured sharply and definitely as it was to be later, in the poems of 1797-8, but it is a part of his recollection of the place, recurring more than once in the poem. And this poem it is that one constantly recalls while reading *Coombe Ellen*. In it are to be found almost all the concrete items of Bowles's description: the dashing torrent, the red berries of the ash, the sheep wandering on the perilous cliff, the towering crag. I should have to copy a large part of both poems to show all the relations and resemblances. Finally, in it occurs the very fancy that Coleridge mentions in the letter to Sotheby, and in the same language, save that a synonym is used:

"Calm Pensiveness might muse herself to sleep."

Here, then, is a sufficient Coleridgean antecedent for Bowles's line, indeed for his whole poem, in a piece he is rather more likely to have seen

than he is to have seen *Melancholy*, tho of course he may well enough have seen both. "About the 6th of September [1797]," says Campbell, "having completed *Osorio* to the middle of the fifth act, [Coleridge] took it over to Shaftesbury to exhibit it to the 'god of his idolatry, Bowles.'" This was his first meeting with the sonneteer. No doubt he took with him, if he had not already sent, a copy of the 1797 *Poems*; very likely he read to Bowles the lines *To a Young Friend, &c.*, very likely also the first draft of *This Lime-Tree Bower*, in connection with the scenes in *Osorio* in which the same material had been used. Coleridge was an impressive reader, especially of his own poetry. Bowles doubtless studied Coleridge's verse with enthusiasm after that meeting; and when, a year later, he found himself in Radnorshire in the midst of scenery such as Coleridge had celebrated, he imitated the lines to Lloyd in *Coombe Ellen*.

Melancholy, I believe, is no more a schoolboy performance than is *Time Real and Imaginary*. Very likely the fancy of *Melancholy* musing herself to sleep was early, a product of the time when Bowles was in the ascendent. It has no necessary connection with Stowey, tho as we have seen he introduced it into his first Stowey poem in 1796. But the lines he printed in the *Morning Post* in December, 1797, and sent to Sotheby in 1802 as a product of his nineteenth year, surely took shape not in 1791 or 1794, but after 1796—after he had seen the Quantocks, and the ash-tree dell in particular.

H. M. BELDEN.

University of Missouri.

⁵ Tho it was from Bowles, apparently, that he learned to feel a special delight in the verb *muse*. It is the best-loved word in Bowles's vocabulary, and became scarcely less a favorite with his young admirers the Pantisocrats. It occurs five times in the first ten sonnets in Gilfillan's edition of Bowles, frequently in association with an evening landscape, a cliff or a hillside with a castle (cf. first two lines of *Melancholy*). It gave a name for Coleridge's *magnum opus* of those days, the *Religious Musings*; it comes in characteristically in the *Monody on the Death of Chatterton*; a sonnet of Lovell's quoted by Cottle (*Reminiscences*, p. 3, Amer. ed. of 1848) cannot avoid it; and Coleridge himself took occasion to ridicule it as a mannerism of the school in the first of the Higginbotham sonnets. It goes back of course to Collins's *Ode to Evening*.

OE. *werg*, *werig* 'ACCURSED'; *wergan* 'TO CURSE.'

The elder school of lexicographers, for example, Ettmüller, *Lex. An. Sax.*, p. 97, Bouterwek, *Ein An. sächs. Glossar.*, p. 297, Grein, *Sprachschatz*, ii, 662-3, treated *werg*, *werig*, *wergan*, &c., meaning 'accursed, to curse,' as having a short vowel. Also the Bosworth-Toller marks the vowel as short, although—unfortunately—entering *werg*, *werig*, *wyrig* under *wearg*. Kluge, *An.*

sächs. *Leseb.*³ enters *wyrġan*, verb, as short, but does not record the nominal form *werg*, *werig*; doubtless for him the vowel is short in all forms. Of late years, however, the practice has crept in of regarding the *e* as long and writing the lemma *wērig*; see Cook, *Christ*, p. 290, and Krapp, *Andrew*, p. 234. To whose doctrine this paralleling of *werg*, *werig* 'accursed' with *wērig* 'weary' may be due, I am unable to say; perhaps to the example of Sweet, who in his *Stud. Dict. of An. Sax.*, p. 205, enters *wierig**, *ē†*, *y* 'accursed.' Clark Hall, *Concise An. Sax. Dict.*, p. 365, col. *b* (near top), enters *wyrge* and (farther down) *wyrig*, both forms with short vowel. Now, although Clark Hall is unjustifiable in his *wyrge* with final *-e*, and although the Bosworth-Toller is absurd in entering *werg*, *werig* under *wearg*, nevertheless the phonology of Ettmüller, Bouterwek, Grein, namely *wērg*, *wērig*, is right and the *wērig* of Cook and Krapp and the *wierig* of Sweet are flatly wrong. See the passing remark by Cosijn, *Beitr.* xx, 109–110. Concerning Krapp in particular, I have grounds for suspecting that his personal belief is against *wērig*.

Every investigation of the question should start from the familiar *warg*, Icel. *vargr*, OE. (WS.) *wearg*, OS. *warag*. The ultimate relations of Germanic *warg-s* have been fully discussed by Kauffmann, *Beitr.* xviii, 175–187. I have not space for even the briefest résumé of Kauffmann's exposition. Let it suffice to say that a *warg-s* was a person who had committed an inexpressible offence, a parricide, who was solemnly thrust out of the community and handed over to the punishment of the gods. The 'wolf' (*werwolf*) is a Scandinavian development. In OE. the word was reduced to mean a miserable one in general, a wretch to be shunned and execrated. Hence the gothic verb *ga-wargġan* 'to condemn, curse,' OE. *wiergan*, *wergan*.

What, then, is the explanation of the OE. nominal forms *werg*, *werig*, &c.? That the Bosworth-Toller is wrong in equating them with *wearg*, the breaking of *warg*, will be evident to one looking more closely into the phonology of the so-called breakings. In OE. the broken vowel begins palatal and ends guttural; of necessity consonants after the vowel are also in the guttural position. The clearest utterance on this

point is found in Bülbring, *Altengl. El. buch*, § 139:

"Die Brechung hat ihren Grund in der velaren, und wenigstens z. T. vielleicht auch labialen, Artikulation bezw. Nebenartikulation, welche den brechenden Konsonanten eigen war: χ [Bülbring's sign for the OE. *h* velar spirant § 480] war jedenfalls auch nach *e* und *i* velar und ähnelte wohl der hinteren Varietät, die heutzutage z. B. von Schweizern (in *iach* 'ich') gesprochen wird; das lange sowohl als das gedeckte *r* wurde mit Hebung der Hinterzunge und vielleicht mit Lippenrundung gesprochen; ebenso das aus dem Urgerm. stammene *ll* und das gedeckte *l*, soweit sie Brechung hervorriefen, d. h. also wie ne. *ll* in *hall*, *full*."

From this it is clear that a velar or labial (non-palatal) breaking *r* in the combination *rg*, *rh*, could not have evolved a parasitic palatal vowel between the *r* and the *g* or *h*. See Sievers, § 213, Anm. on *byrig* (**burgi*) and *burug*. Conversely, if *-rg-*, *-rh-* is non-palatal, the parasitic vowel will also be non-palatal, an *a*, *o*, *u*; this we find in OS. *warag*. According to the Bosworth-Toller assumption: *werg*, *werig* = *wearg*, we should expect such forms as **werug*, **werag*. Yet these are precisely the forms which we never find; we encounter only forms of the *-rig-* type, e. g., *weriga*, *weriges*, *werigra*, *werigum*, *wyrigra*. Especially significant are such forms as *se werga feond*, *Bede* 216/2 (*wer^a* ms. B, Miller, II, p. 230), *þa wergan gastas*, 214/16 (*wērian* ms. B, Miller, II, p. 229). Too much importance need not be attached to the accent in *wērian*. In a text so tangled up and fitful as the OE. *Bede* accent-writing must be of the slightest conceivable significance; see *únalýfedre*, 110/25 (ms. B, Miller, II, p. 101). The accent in *wērian* can indicate nothing more than a late OE. lengthening (sporadic) in open syllable, Sweet, *H. E. S.* § 392. Of far greater significance is the phenomenon that the reduction of *werigan* to *werian*, of *weriga* to *weria* marks the extreme palatalization of *g* in the direction of the *y*-sound.

If *werg* is not = *wearg*, what then is it? Only one explanation suggests itself to me, namely, to assume a stem **wargi-* parallel with the more usual *warg-o-s*. This **wargi-* would produce OE. *werg*, *wierg*, *wyrġ* in accordance with the familiar principles of OE. phonology, while *werig*, *wyrġ*,

&c., are merely the same forms with palatal parasitic vowel, like *byrg*, *byrig* from **burgi-*. Clark Hall's *wyrge*, however, with final *-e* in the lemma, runs counter to Sievers, §§ 133, 269, 302.

On the negative side one has a right to call upon the upholders of the **wērig* form for some explanation. What can be the etymology of **wērig* 'accursed'? OE. *ē*, apart from a very few words like the adverb *hēr*, is the *i*-Umlaut of *ō* or of *ēa*, *ēo*. Now, if there are such stems as *wōr-* (or *wōor-*, *wēar-*) *-ig*, assuredly they have left no trace. Why Sweet in particular should enter *wērig** (in his phonology *īē* is the *i*-Umlaut of *ēa*, *ēo*) yet enter the verb *wiergan* (*i*-Umlaut of *ea*, *eo*) is a puzzle. In what Ablaut relation are *ea*, *eo*, *ēa*, *eo*? Whereas *warg-o-* and **warg-i-* fit into the OE. vowel system without a wrench. For the connection between *warg-* and Latin *virga*, *virgula*, see Kauffmann; the 'twig' was attached to the neck of the parricide as a symbol and badge.

A few words upon the metrical aspects of **wērig* versus *werg*. A hemistich of the type **féond | wērigne* or **wērigne | féond* would point conclusively to **wērig*. But there is no such hemistich; the reader may satisfy himself by consulting Grein. There is not a line in OE. poetry which compels us to scan **wērig*; on the contrary, *wērig* is the almost unavoidable scansion. For example, *werige mid werigum*, *Andrew* 615a; read either: *wērige mid | wērigum* or *wērige mid | wērigum*, as unmistakably preferable to *wērige mid | wērigum*, which—according to Sievers, *Altgerm. Metrik*, § 78.5—we should stress: *wērige mid. | wērigum*.

A final word of correction. The Bosworth-Toller cites *Genesis* 906 under *weary* 'accursed,' although more than twenty years ago Sievers, *Beitr.* x, 512, corrected the ms. *werg* to *wērig*. It will be well to examine the passage in full:

pu scealt wideferhð werig þinum
breostum bearm tredan bradre eorðan, &c.

The emendation *bradre* for the ms. *brade* is by Dietrich, *Zs. f. d. Alt.* x, 318. Properly interpreted, the passage means: 'Thou (the serpent) shalt all thy life weary on thy breast(s) tread the lap of the broad earth.' This is fairly equivalent to: 'Upon thy belly shalt thou go,' *Gen.* III, 14.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *PERICLES*, v, 1, 1-101.

It is now almost universally admitted that, with the possible exception of a few scattered phrases, the first two acts of *Pericles* are not from Shakspeare's hand. The last three, however, seem to reveal his mind and art at nearly every point. Even the repulsive scenes in the brothel were probably revised and in part rewritten by the master, with the especial purpose of glorifying Marina's character. No scene save these,¹ in Acts III-V, has hitherto been challenged.

There is, nevertheless, at least one passage of considerable length—the first hundred lines of the fifth act—which may well awaken suspicion. It shows surprising poverty of style and thought if compared with the portions immediately preceding and following, and betrays, furthermore, some important inconsistencies which demand explanation. One of these is something of which it is difficult to believe that Shakspeare could have been guilty. He is careful to represent Marina as a model of young womanhood, and so well does he succeed that she is not unworthy to be placed beside those wonderful creations of his best plays—Imogen, Hermione, Cordelia, for example. Now Marina, like Cordelia, is attractive in no small degree by reason of her modesty; yet in the passage under suspicion she is given a speech which is wholly out of accord with this modesty:

"I am a maid,
My lord, that ne'er before invited eyes,
But have been gazed on like a comet."

If this is Shakspeare's touch, the only remaining theory is that her character is drawn in a glaringly inconsistent fashion. And this I believe to be next to impossible, for in 1608 (the year in which *Pericles* was probably staged) he was in the full maturity of his genius.

Another inconsistency is concerned with Marina's occupation. It was first noted by Mr. F. G. Fleay (*A Shakespeare Manual*, p. 210), who, however, did not deny Shakspeare's authorship of the passage:

"She is all happy as the fairest of all,
And with her fellow maids is now upon
The leafy shelter that abuts against
The island's side." (v, 1, 49-52.)

¹ The Gower prologues, or choruses, however, are admittedly non-Shakspearean.